

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 7, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs begs leave to present the following as their second report. Your committee has considered Bills No. 20, an Act to amend The Transcona Charter; No. 26, an Act to assist Municipalities to Finance Capital Works; No. 48, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1; No. 67, an Act to amend The St. James Charter; No. 94, an Act to amend an Act respecting the Town of Souris; and No. 95, an Act respecting business tax within The Rural Municipality of Fort Garry; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills No. 66, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter; No. 68, an Act to validate By-law No. 3783/64 of The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and By-law No. 9859 of The City of St. James and an Agreement between The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and The City of St. James executed pursuant to those By-laws; No. 96, an Act to validate By-law No. 405 of The Village of Shoal Lake and By-law No. 750 of The Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake; and No. 97, an Act to Establish Riverside Cemetery Board for the Operation of a Cemetery serving The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and The Town of Dauphin; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): . . . table the second report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the reading of the report be dispensed with.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, resolved that this House doth concur in the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders received by this House on the 7th day of April, 1964, and also in the recommendations made therein.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, I should have moved that the report be received. I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that the report be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McLEAN: Now the motion.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 25 Grade 11 students from Riverton High School under the direction of their teacher, W. Johansson. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Education. There are some 33 Grade 6 students from St. Mary's Academy under the direction of their teacher, Miss Faryon. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again!

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders are called, I would like to make a correction of a news report appearing in this morning's Tribune

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . which quotes me as saying that assistance will be given by Manitoba to British Columbia tidal victims. There's a slight twist on that. What I really said was that we had asked the Winnipeg Flood Disaster Fund to consider making some help available for these people, which is a little bit different from what the report conveys, so I would just like to offer that correction.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): In view of the controversy over the report on amalgamation, could the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicate which individual or department produced the report?

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps I had better answer that question, Madam Speaker. The report was prepared by members of the government staff and of course the government takes the responsibility for anything in this report.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could the Honourable the First Minister tell us which department then, is there any special department . . . ?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think I should do that, Madam Speaker. The government takes the responsibility. The report of course was prepared on request and was based on assumptions which seemed valid to the government and of course is available for the City of Winnipeg to do with as they wished.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, could the Honourable the First Minister answer who made this request to who -- directly to the government or to any . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I can say that the City Council of Winnipeg passed a resolution which was forwarded to me asking if the government would give them some kind of a report on this particular subject, and in response to that request we had this report prepared.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): The Honourable the First Minister said that the government would accept responsibility for the compilation of the report. Will the Honourable the First Minister also declare that the government will accept the responsibility for the figures or total amount referred to in the report?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't think that my honourable friend should ask us to do that. We were asked to prepare an estimate according to our judgment of the situation and we have done so, but it is only an estimate. It is based on certain assumptions, and I freely admit that different assumptions could be made, it depends on whatever set of assumptions you wish to choose. We were asked to make a report; we did so; and that's all there is to it as far as we are concerned.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I take it from the Honourable Minister's remarks, Madam Speaker, he accepts no responsibility as to the accuracy of the statement or report that has been made.

MR. ROBLIN: No, my honourable friend is putting words in my mouth. What I would like to say is that given the assumptions on which the report is based, we think the figures are correct, but it is open to anyone to challenge the assumption or pick a different set of assumptions if they want to.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm not asking if it's based upon assumptions at all. I'm basing my remarks on the report that has been tabled in this House by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think my honourable friend could have read it because if he had he would note there are a very clear set of assumptions on which the report is based, and the figures only follow from the assumptions. You alter the assumptions you get different figures.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure my friend, Madam Speaker, that I have read the report.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . sure you're finished? Madam Speaker, today we ask the Honourable the First Minister then if there is any truth in the statement that this report has been ready for a number of days and was held back until the eve of this referendum on amalgamation.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I think if my honourable friend sees the report he will note the date on which it was completed and made available to me, as being a date in March of this year, and so that there is no question of it being held back for any purpose.

MR. G. E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible, and I'm not sure which one. In view of the widespread dissatisfaction in rural Manitoba with the recent increase in person-to-person long distance rates, is it the Minister's intention to take the necessary steps to rescind the increase?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, if I may answer that question, I expect at 3:30 this

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . afternoon to be meeting with a number of representatives from local areas in the Province of Manitoba to discuss this matter with them, and I hope that it may be possible that something fruitful comes of that. But if my honourable friend has been listening to the debates in the House, as I am sure he has, he will know just as well as I that what he suggests is not within the legislative competence of the government to do. We have no authority to alter those rates. The rates are set by the telephone company under the statute passed by this House many years ago and they are subject only to review by the Utility Board which hears all parties who might be interested and which renders its decision, and it must be perfectly clear that there is no legislative competence at our disposal to make any change in that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, could I ask the First Minister if the Cabinet, as such, has no influence on the Utility Board.

MR. ROBLIN: That is absolutely right. If we were caught meddling with that my honourable friend would be singing an entirely different tune this afternoon.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. As the Minister is aware, the School District of Clearwater in reports over the past several months has made application to be allowed out of the school division in which it is situated. I would like to ask the Minister what is the present disposition of that move or application on their part.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, as far as I am aware, they made an appeal to the Clerk of the County Court and the judgment was given. I was not aware that they had appealed further. I met with the group in question from Clearwater, some gentlemen from that area, and at the time I believe they were thinking of discussing this with legal counsel in the city here, and following that meeting I have not heard further. However, I point out to my honourable friend that the authority was given to the division, the Pembina Valley School Division, to proceed with the new high school at Crystal City about, I think last October -- mid-October of last year. I have had no correspondence or no notification from the Pembina Valley School Division to alter their decision to proceed nor have they spoken to me further about it.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister tell me when the date of commencement of construction is in the new school?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I haven't got that information at the moment.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to pursue my efforts to obtain my Order for Return from the Minister of Public Utilities. When did he indicate I'm going to get it? It's over a month now since the Order was presented to the House and I think it's about time we got it.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . but you'll get the Order in time to discuss it when the item comes up in the estimates.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I believe the First Minister indicated that there is a delegation coming today on the matter of the increase in telephone rates. I believe this is a rather large delegation representing many of the municipalities of Manitoba and various bodies like the Chambers of Commerce and so on. Is it the intention of the First Minister to adjourn the House so that all of the members can meet with that delegation this afternoon at 3:00 or 3:30 when they're due, and then we could resume our meeting after we meet with them?

MR. ROBLIN: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I can address a question to the Attorney-General. I asked this question yesterday regarding the plane crash at Thompson in which four people were killed, and whether or not an inquest had been held or was to be held. He then answered that he wasn't sure but that he would make some enquiries. I wonder if he could now acquaint the House with the result of his enquiries.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I ordered the inquest.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it correct then that until this morning there had been no inquest called in this crash?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct. Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the crash occurred several days

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . ago, that the bodies were removed several days ago to Ottawa or to Toronto, should not this inquest have been called prior to this?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate why the inquest was not called prior to this?

MR. McLEAN: I wish I could.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The First Minister indicated I'd get the Order in time to discuss it on the estimates. Could he indicate what estimates I can discuss them on?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . .

HON. R. G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Member from St. George asked me a question concerning the unconditional grants for Steeprock School District in 1961 some time ago, and I would report to him that the grant was paid on January 23rd, 1962. The cheque represented the grant for a population of 224 or \$672.00 and was payable to Mrs. E. Svanhill of Steeprock, Manitoba.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did you get a grant for 1962 then? The school board says they never got it. They only got cheques for so many years and the one cheque was missing, and they said '61. They're under the impression then that the cheque they got in '62 was for '62.

MR. SMELLIE: I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend might ask for an Order for Return if he wants any additional information.

MR. SCHREYER: I wonder if I could go back to the question which I asked of the Minister of Education a few minutes ago. It is my understanding that the Pembina Valley School Division is going to start construction of a school for which the Department gave approval around the middle of April, and if this is so, I would ask the Minister if he will consider withdrawing approval temporarily until such time as the Clearwater School District has had an opportunity to appeal the decision of county court. My question is, has the Minister given consideration to the temporary withdrawal of approval? That's the first question.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll take notice of this question, Madam Speaker. This is the matter of the School Division of Pembina Valley, and I'll look into it further.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you! Madam Speaker, there's a supplementary question which can go as notice also. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he has had any formal request from the Clearwater School District to withdraw such approval temporarily?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I've had -- I'll take it as notice.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, in view of the statement made by the First Minister that the Government of Manitoba had no jurisdiction over fixing telephone rates and in respect of the delegation which the First Minister intends to meet this afternoon at 3:30 -- in view of the Minister's statement that the government has no jurisdiction respecting telephone rates and that it is a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Utility Board, has the First Minister considered the propriety of meeting with this delegation?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I have considered the propriety and I consider it my duty to hear them.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the First Minister considered that meeting with this delegation will have any influence or effect on the decision of the Utility Board.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm meeting with this delegation at their request and I think I should oblige them.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary question. As the First Minister's duty is to guide this House and to inform us of his actions, I would like him to tell us on what basis he considered it was his duty to meet with this delegation.

MR. ROBLIN: That's a question which I don't think I should be called upon to answer, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Address for Papers. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an humble address be voted His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing: copies of all correspondence to and from the Government of Manitoba and/or the Centennial Committee to any and all interested parties regarding the building of an Arts

(Mr. Pauley, Cont'd.) . . . Centre in the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we accept the question, subject to the usual reservation in respect of the Federal Government.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, might I request if it's only in respect of the federal government and if that is going to be delayed, could the First Minister give me the copies of all other correspondence that is not subject to reservations pending the receipt of approval from any federal authorities.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll do the best we can, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: How many people have gone to jail for failing to pay their hospitalization premiums since the start of the Manitoba Hospital Plan in 1958?

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of accidents in the construction industry, including excavation jobs, and steel erection work in which injuries were incurred in each of the years for the past ten years. 2. The number of accidents in the aforesaid industries in which deaths resulted in each of the years for the past ten years, and the total number of deaths in each of the said years. 3. The number of investigations into the aforesaid accidents carried out by the Department of Labour. 4. The number of violations of safety regulations cited by the Department of Labour. 5. The number of convictions for violation of safety regulations cited by the Department of Labour.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Madam Speaker, there is one reservation that I would like to point out here, that we could only supply the information on the accidents that we know about. I'm sure in the construction industry there are many accidents that are not reported. We would report on the knowledgeable accidents, either within our Department or the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill: No. 74, an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

Bill No. 74 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 74, directed me to report the same without amendment, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bill No. 74 was read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Wellington, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, nothing has been said in favour of the human element in the matter of transferring nearly 1,000 employees from Winnipeg. The

(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . . factors involved are: (a) uprooting some 1,000 families and forcing them to relocate themselves in another city. While in itself there is nothing wrong with people moving to another city, the fact that in this instance the transfer is to a predominantly French city where a Cultural and Linguistic revolution is in progress, the newcomers are unable to contribute to the Cultural progress of the community. (b) The way of life in the Province of Quebec is much different to say the least. The Napoleonic Law is different from the common law usage of the Province of Manitoba. People having been forced to move for economic reasons, because they know no other trade than the aircraft industry, are not necessarily prepared to adopt the new way of life. Thus, are they expected to be active in the civic affairs of the community they have moved to? Can they play an intelligent part? Is it not more likely that they will be indifferent generally and help to increase the number of eligible voters voters who chose to ignore the polls on election day and remain pre-occupied with only one thing, economic survival.

The subject matter lends itself very well to the main fault in question -- transportation. It seems that with all the improved methods and means of transportation, we deem it best to transport people rather than economics. The annual figure saved by the transfer to Montreal is roughly \$2 million. The present cost of our interest on the national debt alone amounts to close to \$3 million per day, let alone the amount per year as listed in the federal estimates at \$1,035,000,000. Divide this by 365 days gives you the figure \$2,841,000 per day. No effort is made to stop deficit budgeting in order to save the taxpayer further increases in this debt cost. The mention of \$2 million savings a year compared to \$3 million in debt cost per day is about as ridiculous as the American President's light switch exercise, reducing the light bill while more money is spent than a balanced economy can afford to spend.

Are we moving towards the dark age again? It seems that even now the government at Ottawa is not certain of the future of TCA or other aspects of our economy, and the bureaucrats are having a picnic. I hope the Manitoba government sees in this manoeuvre by TCA a resemblance to its own policy or the Metro planners' policy of centralization. The municipalities of Greater Winnipeg pleaded with the Roblin administration to adopt some other form of inter-municipal service than the present form of Metro, yet through pride in a government-sponsored bill, mixed with false impressions of progress and economy through centralization, the Metro planners managed to railroad the entire province into a set-up which, in my opinion, Manitobans will always regret.

You have undoubtedly sensed my attitude on this matter. I say to you frankly, Ottawa or TCA has more or less made up its mind. There is not much you can do to change it unless you seek ways and means of moving the nations' economics to where the nations needs are greatest. That, of course, means statesmanship, financial statesmanship. Unless you in the other parties in this House are prepared to accept the Social Credit principles and work for the reconstruction of democracy as democracy is meant to be, you will be witnesses to more centralization, more public disinterest and unrest, more unemployment and misery, more welfare and government schemes. Then finally, socialism that will resemble so much the compulsory governmental administration of the Soviet Union, that only the name of your political parties will be different from the Communist Party. Political democracy cannot exist without economic and social democracy. The transfer of TCA should serve as an object lesson to us all, of what a tax-supported Crown corporation can do when it gets out of hand.

Statesmanship in itself means that one is conscious and concerned with the welfare of future generations. The present economic turmoil not only ignores our future generations, it is taxing them in advance, committing for generations to come the natural resources that are ours today but theirs tomorrow. Financial statesmanship can only take effect when the government has attained the position of being a substantive power in finance. Statesmanship is the highest kind of political realism, the other name for it being wise foresight. But to foresee wisely, one must divine the true nature of the actual present; one must comprehend the actual constitution of the living actual society. And equally, one must see the potentialities, the directions things are going to take, the true promises of future movements. This, the double view that takes in the actual and the potential, the present and the future, is the truly realistic view. A conservative statement reckons with the possibilities of improvement in the future, as did Edmund Burke when he wrote that "a disposition to preserve, and an ability to



(Mr. Froese, Cont'd.) . . . improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman."

Madam Speaker, when I look through the various reports that were presented, I find that the basic or initial, the first decision with its far reaching implications and consequences were not made known to the public, even to the provincial government that is directly concerned. These things are done as though very innocent on the surface but knowing full well the intention or ultimate purpose as we now see it demonstrated before our very eyes. These things were all planned way back in '49, but by going about it in a piecemeal way they have been successful thus far in their program and in their plan to centralize the air transport industry in one location, namely Montreal.

It seems to me that we're beginning to reap the fruits of the seed of socialism sown by and in establishing the many Crown agencies that are, in effect, monopolies. They are now telling their creators what to do. Instead of the government giving direction, it is taking orders and becoming subordinate to monopoly powers. I feel that the provincial government should have a voice, a greater say in the matter of federal Crown agencies. I feel that they should have annual occasions, such as the Dominion-Provincial conferences, to discuss future contemplations of these Crown agencies. They should discuss policy changes in connection with such agencies as the TCA, the CNR, the Canadian Wheat Board, PFRA and even the Bank of Canada, because they can and do play such an important part in the economy of our country and the various provinces of Canada. Would that the present government in Manitoba would take the stand here at home that they are advocating for the government of Canada in connection with TCA.

When I turn to page 18 of the brief of December the 17th, I find Recommendation No. 50, which reads as follows: "The federal government must consider the implications of its presently indicated course of action. It must realize that the action it has taken so far is at its best a stop-gap. It is permitting centralization to take place in spite of its own repeated assertions that centralization is not in the national interest." And further in section 52, I read: "We recognize that TCA must operate as efficiently as possible and we do not oppose any routine plans to improve operating efficiency of the organization, but the overriding considerations of national development and prosperity, national unity and national security are involved, and the federal government must take a stand against this move toward centralization."

Madam Speaker, when I go through this report there are so many things that I can wholeheartedly endorse, and I feel that whoever wrote the report made a very good job and I feel I can support it wholeheartedly.

Then coming back to the resolution before us, I find that the resolution requests that this House support the brief presented to the Government of Canada by the Manitoba delegation on December 17th, 1963, and urges the Government of Canada to restore the jet overhaul base at Winnipeg. Certainly there is nothing there that we cannot endorse. However, I feel that since the Liberals have brought in an amendment to it and since we've also had further correspondence and words from the Prime Minister of Canada, that the situation is somewhat changed, I feel that we should unite rather than try and vote on the amendments and the resolution. Why not get together? I think this is too important a matter to be divided on. I feel that we should be unified in this situation and show with one voice that we are supporting this industry in Manitoba and that we wish it retained.

I was not in when the delegations went to Ottawa to make the presentations. I was not advised of it. However, if I'd been I would certainly have gone along and I would have paid my own expenses because I feel this is a very worthy matter and something that we should support wholeheartedly. So I'm in full accordance with the resolution and I will support it.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Wellington in amendment thereto.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. G. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before the debate closes, I would like to deal with particularly two remarks that have been made,

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) . . . or two attitudes that have been made evident. The first is the criticism which appears to have been levelled at me for the attitude taken towards Mr. McGregor and for the statements made. It has been my attitude that the management of TCA, and I mention this is in the person of Mr. McGregor mainly, has misled the people and has caused some of the moves to be made in contradiction to statements that they made in public of their actual policy in doing so.

Now the term "scurrilous," or verging on the scurrilous was applied to these remarks of mine by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, and I'm sorry he's not in his place because I would like to lay before him and before the House the facts as I see them, which I think have justified and do in fact justify the description that I gave of them, and so I am going to read onto the record the facts that I have before me so that honourable members will have a chance of knowing what these facts are. It will take the form of describing the events in chronological sequence and I think it will be seen that repeatedly there was a statement of policy on behalf of TCA management, or by the government on the advice of TCA, followed by a series of events which did, in fact, contradict that policy.

Beginning then in 1949, effective January 1st, the executive headquarters was moved to Montreal. Assurance was given by the president at that time that this was not to be construed as the beginning of a mass move from Winnipeg, and subsequently at a hearing of the sessional Committee on Railways, Airlines and Shipping on April 5th to April 7th, 1949, the president said, and I quote his words: "TCA's long association with Winnipeg has been a very happy one and will continue as long as I can see in Winnipeg. As I understand it, the great fear is that this is simply the withdrawal of the bung from the barrel and that the whole content is going to flow out as a result. I would like to reiterate my previous statement and that of the directors of TCA as such, I am referring to the board of directors, that none of us can see any possibility of such an action proving to be economical. All the company's engine overhaul work is done in Winnipeg, thus to disrupt that situation would be unthinkable. That machinery could not be transplanted. The cost of moving it would be tremendous and TCA would be moving from an area in which it can hire good mechanical help in an apparently abundant supply into an area that supply, both as to quantity and quality, is not comparable. I fully agree with all the arguments advanced by Manitoba in that regard."

And then I interpolate here that he goes on to deal with the kinds of aircraft which were to appear in the future. His words continue: "I would like to think that the argument would apply fully as well to jet aircraft. The airlines took on Rolls Royce fluid-cooled engines after having operated with radio air-cooled engines entirely and it follows exactly that program, so I see no reason why the introduction of jet or prop jet engines would not fit in satisfactorily with conversion of that overhaul base to exactly the same type of work. I am sincere when I say that it is inconceivable that this consolidation of headquarters, with which I think nobody can argue from an administrative point of view, forms the beginning of a move by such a group as the engine repair group and the accounting group, which constitute by far the greatest proportion of our employees in Winnipeg."

But in the same session of the Committee on Railways, Airlines and Shipping, the president went on to say and I quote his words: "TCA is not moving any organized labour from Winnipeg to Montreal, nor is it contemplating doing so. Winnipeg is not going to lose an industry as far as I can possibly see it." And at the same committee and immediately afterwards the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Honourable C. D. Howe stated, and I quote: "I think if an attempt was made by the directors to move the overhaul department or the accounting department after the remarks of the president, I would have good reason to put a veto upon the suggestions. I say that, as an added assurance to those employees who are fearful of having to move, they need have no such fear." Now those dates were April 5 to 7 of 1949.

Then, despite these statements, the following transfers of Winnipeg TCA operations were made to Montreal during the early 1950's. In 1950, the Publications, Pass and Stationery Bureaus were transferred to Montreal, and North Star aircraft and component parts were moved to Montreal for maintenance and overhaul. In 1951, a major portion of the engineering department was transferred to Montreal along with several technicians in the radio shop; 1952, communications laboratory and library were transferred to Montreal; 1953, control of the DC-3 phase-out was shifted to Montreal; 1956, the major part of the radio shop was moved to

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) . . . Montreal; in October of 1956, the president of TCA again denied any intention to consolidate overhaul facilities in Montreal. In 1957, on October 29th in Winnipeg at a press conference, the president of TCA advised that DC-8's and the Vikings would be overhauled in Montreal, that Viscounts would be overhauled at Winnipeg, and he went on to state, and I quote: "It is not expected that there will be any reduction in the personnel requirements at the Winnipeg base."

The president of the airline has obviously convinced the federal government that operations at the Winnipeg base would not be reduced in any way as the Minister of Transport confirms these views when he stated in Parliament on November 12th, 1957, as stated in the Debates and Proceedings at page 948: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for his courtesy in advising me of his intention to ask this question. I would refer him to my answer to the question asked by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, Mr. Knowles, on October 29th last, when I assured him that Trans Canada Airlines did not expect in any way to diminish repair and maintenance operations in Winnipeg. Therefore, I do not think the employees of Trans Canada Airlines in Winnipeg need have any fears whatsoever."

Despite these assurances the following transfers of Winnipeg based TCA operations to Montreal were announced in the late 1950's and early 1960's. In 1958 on October 23rd it was announced in the press that 100 employees of the Winnipeg instrument shop would be moved to Montreal by 1960. In 1959, January, the president of the airlines stated that 30 or 40 instrument shop employees and a few specialty workers would be moved to Montreal. In 1961, on May 13th, it was reported in the Winnipeg papers that the local TCA's overhaul base would be closed down by 1965 or shortly thereafter. This apparently was a reference to a letter from the Honourable Leon Balcer to the St. James Chamber of Commerce. In 1962, on November 14th, the president of the airline advised Winnipeg based employees that operations would be phased out by 1966 when the new jets were scheduled for delivery.

That is the chronology of the events as they happened, but there is one overriding consideration that I think should be on the records, which shows the emptiness of the assurances that the president gave from time to time, and I think it confirms the fact that he misled the people in doing so. He made a statement at the sessional Committee on Railways, Airlines, and Shipping on December 2nd to 5th, 1963, as follows: "If we are able, as we see it, in the late 1960's in respect to DC-8s, Vikings and Viscounts, as well as the new Jets, to do the overhaul work at Dorval, there would have to be some expansion of facilities at Dorval but"-- these are the significant words -- "the Dorval base was built with exactly this in mind." I think we have to cast our minds back to the dates on which the assurance was given that when the Dorval base was planned, and obviously before it was built, there was the intention to overhaul Viscounts at Montreal, and that statement was made before the repeated assurances that I have read onto the record.

This statement by the president is confirmation of our stand that he had planned the consolidation of TCA overhaul facilities at Montreal directly contradictory to his public protestations to the contrary. The plan was to construct the present Dorval facilities -- and we understand that it was a basic part of the Wallace and Clark report completed on May 31, 1957 -- the actual plans must have been made several years prior to this when the president was denying that there was any intention of transferring the Winnipeg overhaul base to Montreal. And so I give to my honourable friend the facts upon which I based the statement and which he castigated in rather strong terms. I lay before the House the facts upon which I based that.

I would like now to turn to other points as to whether or not the government was in fact engaged in this business of trying to retain the TCA base some time prior to or during the time when my honourable friends of the Liberal Party seemed to think we were doing nothing but merely catching onto a parade that was formed up by someone else. In fact, I was asked by the Leader of the Opposition as to why I had not informed the House of this, why I had not spoken of the matter to the House and why, in fact, I had not done anything of consequence in the period of August, 1960 until December, 1962 when the delegation left. So I propose to place on the record briefly the main moves that were made by the government and a history of how this matter has developed.

Well one of the first things that I reviewed when I came into office were the outstanding matters which had been left to us by the preceding government, and I noted a letter by the then

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) . . . Premier, the Honourable Douglas Campbell, to the Prime Minister of Canada in 1957, I think it was, dealing with the fears of Manitoba in connection with the transfer of the TCA base. Following up that matter on March 11, I drew the matter of the base transfer to the attention of the Honourable George Hees who was then Minister of Transport. In his reply to me, the Honourable George Hees on March 11 stated that there was no major change in employment at Winnipeg over the next few years in prospect. He said, in part, in his letter: "In their report to me the management have reiterated their previous advice, advice which I understand they likewise have given to the Winnipeg people a number of times. In short, it is that little change in the overhaul TCA employment situation at Winnipeg is expected within the next few years. I might add that they have drawn to my attention the fact that during the 1947 to 1959 period these employees increased in number from 1,500 to 2,000."

Well, on receiving that letter from the Honourable George Hees I could not reconcile it with the fact that transfers were actually taking place at that time, and I think one or two members of the House, notably the present Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, kept drawing to my attention the fact that the employees and people that he knew were in fact leaving Winnipeg for Montreal and were being transferred, and so I kept pressing the matter. On June 10th I wrote the Honourable George Hees asking for further assurances in this matter. One or two telephone conversations followed and finally, in order to clear up this matter, I decided -- this was early July -- to go and see Mr. Hees personally and discuss with him the individual cases that I knew. It seemed right that I should ask him for a conference, which he granted to me. I went down and discussed the matter and showed him the evidence that I had that these moves were continuing. He again reviewed the matter with the TCA management, at the conclusion of which he apparently recognized that the situation I had laid before him was correct, because on August 10th he wrote to me to say that there were no plans to keep the Winnipeg base open after the Viscounts had been phased out. This was the breakthrough to which I referred earlier. This was the first time that it was in fact discussed and acknowledged that the move of the entire based was planned after the Viscounts had gone out of service.

Then early in 1961, on March 20, and I think in response to a question asked by my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I did make a statement in the Legislature and in order that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition can have the information, I propose to read a few of the remarks that I made at that time. This was during the estimates of my department, the Department of Industry and Commerce on March 20, 1961.

"Now with regard to the last point and the one that is a matter of considerable concern to my friend the Leader of the CCF Party, I may say that I share his concern completely with regard to Trans Canada servicing. It seems clear now that as Trans Canada Air Lines go out of propeller-driven aircraft, by that much will they decrease their servicing in Winnipeg and what has been a substantial industry in Winnipeg and Manitoba will be diminishing by that amount.

"When they went into jet powered aircraft they set up servicing facilities at Montreal and Vancouver and do, in fact, conduct their servicing at those two points. There may be some technical reasons for it but I am not well qualified to go into it. I think at Montreal, for example, they feel that to have servicing facilities at the end of a flight across Canada and to be able to service the plane before it takes off over the ocean for England is one of the reasons for placing this servicing facility in Montreal, but I am not here to defend their policy. I disagree with their policy. I have made the strongest representation that I am able to, both in written form and by personal visits, and it was only comparatively recently, certainly within the last year, that we were able to secure from Trans Canada Air Lines a statement of the fact that this was indeed their policy.

"We saw these people disappearing as my honourable friend has drawn attention to. My honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre kept informing me of other people that he knew who were moving from Winnipeg to Montreal in the service of Trans Canada Air Lines. I kept pressing for a statement and kept receiving perhaps less than definite statements from Trans Canada Air Lines. Nevertheless within the last year we have received the statements that it is the policy not to place jet servicing facilities in Winnipeg. Well this raises a very large matter for us to consider as seriously as possible. This is one of the reasons that I welcomed the Dew Line operation so much, not only for the business that it would generate for suppliers in Manitoba but for the strength that it adds and will add to the one airline, TransAir, and by

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) . . . that much strengthen the air industry here. It will strengthen the servicing or ancillary services that do support these air lines." Well this statement was given in the House and I think answers the statement that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition made to the effect that I had not in fact drawn the attention of the House to this situation.

Then back in the same year 1961 I called a meeting of the Manitoba Transportation Commission, and for the purpose, I added to it the invitations to a number of people representing interests in the province which were affected or would be affected by the transfers. I would like to read into the record the names of the people who attended this meeting on June 19, 1961.

Those present as members of the Manitoba Transportation Commission were: Mr. R. C. Brown, Vice-President of United Grain Growers Ltd.; Professor Ralph Harris, Head of the School of Commerce, University of Manitoba; Mr. Roger Teillet, Executive Director of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce who must have been well acquainted with the Leader of the Opposition and who might, if he had seen fit, very easily got in touch with him and declared this was an important matter and he might pay attention to it; Mr. N. S. Bergman, Industrial Commissioner of the Brandon Chamber of Commerce; R. N. Boyd, Traffic Manager, Westfair Foods Limited; John S. Baldner, President of Robinson and Webber; Evan McCormick, Executive Director of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce; A. V. Mauro, Provincial Freight Rates Council; Harry Munro, Secretary of the Manitoba Federation of Labour; W. Fraser, Q.C., Solicitor of the City of Winnipeg. All those were members of the Manitoba Transportation Commission.

Present by invitation for this special meeting was Mayor J. Dickson, the Mayor of North Kildonan; E. Bodie, Councillor representing the City of Winnipeg; F. Byle, Councillor representing the Rural Municipality of West St. Paul; R. D. Turner, President of TransAir Ltd.; L. E. Jones, Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia; D. Sanderson, the Assistant Secretary of the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry; Mayor T. B. Findlay, Mayor of St. James; J. Bourke, Alderman representing the City of St. James; S. Morgan, Councillor representing the City of St. James; A. Coulter, Councillor representing Metro Council; D. Swailes, Alderman representing the City of Winnipeg; F. W. Crawford, Alderman representing the City of Winnipeg; S. J. Carter, E. A. Smith, N. Radford, J. M. Easton, and R. A. Peterson, representing TCA Airline Lodge No. 714, International Association of Machinists; H. Miloff and S. MacDonald representing the management of TCA; Reeve S. Roscoe, the reeve of the Rural Municipality of Springfield; and D. Nimchuck, Councillor representing the Rural Municipality of Springfield. I take the time to read that list of people who are partly members of the Manitoba Transportation Commission and partly invited to join us for this special purpose to illustrate the fact that I considered it necessary to bring a complete community effort behind the move to retain the base if we were to have any form of success.

Then while that Transportation Commission met and received briefs from anyone who wished to present a brief at that time, and some did, we asked the Commission to consider the matter and let the government have their advice as to what move should be made, what kind of a case should be made to the Ottawa government and indeed how it should be presented. The Manitoba government placed at the disposal of the Transportation Commission for this purpose a staff of my own department, and a good deal of work was done in following these moves.

In the meantime, it was considered necessary to take every possible move to help to strengthen the air industry generally and the honourable members will remember that we were successful in strengthening Winnipeg as an air centre by securing the Dew Line supply base for Winnipeg, and in 1963 -- no, in 1961, the Dew Line re-supply base was established in Winnipeg in July of 1961. We further made representations before the Air Transport Board at a meeting in Regina in favour of TransAir securing the prairie services run of the Trans Canada Air Lines and, as members know, this service was inaugurated from Winnipeg in 1963.

At the same time, the committee on Manitoba's Economic Future was formed and the members of the Manitoba Transportation Commission served as members of the COMEF advisory group and, as the members will know, there's a considerable section in that report dealing with Winnipeg as an overhaul base. Then in 1962 we did have the formal representations made to us as referred to by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of Airline Lodge No. 714 when they called on Premier Roblin, and I would not want to indicate that this is the first

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) . . . time in which the Union had taken part in this because they were very active from the beginning as my honourable friends will remember from the list of events that I have read. The did participate in the meeting of the Manitoba Transportation Commission referred to.

Thereafter of course the delegations visited Ottawa on January 29, 1963, June 18, 1963 and December 17, 1963. I thought it was right, Madam Speaker, to place on the record the sequence of events, the efforts that have been made by the government and the moves that were made to continue the effort and to arouse a community move to retain in Winnipeg and in Manitoba the TCA overhaul base and indeed to perpetuate it and carry it forward into the jet age.

Having been challenged on the grounds that the government has done nothing from August 1960 until December 1962, I thought it right to give a very brief outline of the efforts that were made and, in fact, statements that were made in the House. I warned my honourable friends in that corner of the House that if they had done their homework they would have got themselves in somewhat less of an embarrassing position than they find themselves in now. I don't wish to renew the debate on the question of who's going to get political advantage out of this. I think my honourable friend from Rhineland has the right principle. I think we should close ranks, fight for the TCA base and fight for Manitoba together and shoulder to shoulder.

I think it may be evident to some now as to why we had not extended invitations either to all the party leaders as such or to members of the Legislature to join the delegation. This first of all arose as a matter left unfinished by the last government when it left office. I took it up from that point as a purely government matter. At one point it seemed wise to gather together under the auspices of the Manitoba Transportation Commission all those that have practical concern in this matter, all those who were going to suffer either as business interests or as employees, to join forces together to form a delegation.

It had never been done that I remember, to invite political parties to participate as political parties. This matter was raised by the Leader of the NDP group only, and as was said in this House, I told him that as the leader of a political party I was not going to suggest that he join the delegation in that capacity, but that if he wished to come in his personal capacity he would be more than welcome. If the Leader of the Opposition had phoned me, he would have got exactly the same answer. He chose not to, and so I didn't make any further move in that direction. The same argument would have applied to my honourable friend from Rhineland. If he had phoned me, I would have told him that we were not inviting political parties to join, but that if anyone of goodwill wanted to-- anybody wanted to help the cause would come along, he was more than welcome and would be made very much at home.

However, after the delegation did take off, I think it right to say that to every meeting after that the leaders of the two principal opposition parties were invited and on many occasions did come out and listened to the discussions and in some cases made suggestions for the improvement of the briefs and so on. So that is the recital of events, Madam Speaker, intended to place on the record the information on which I claimed that the government had taken action, and I think intelligent and forceful action with respect to organizing Manitoba for the retention of the overhaul base in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say a word or two. It appears as though the debate is rapidly coming to a conclusion on this resolution that has been on the Order Paper for a considerable period of time. I would like to say that now the final stages of the debate have been arrived at, that we of this Manitoba Legislature should forget any differences of opinion that may have been expressed during the debate as to whether you did or whether you did not get together in the interests of the retention of the base here in the Province of Manitoba.

We did receive assurances a few days ago by some telegrams from the Prime Minister of Canada in reply to stated questions submitted to him by the Government of Manitoba to the effect that the base apparently would be retained here in Manitoba and not phased-out until 1973. But, Madam Speaker, I want to warn however that notwithstanding the assurances that were given by the telegrams, that there is a possibility that during the process there continued to be a "hacking away" of the forces that are employed at the base in the City of St. James, and that we should continue our endeavours to attempt to have the management of the Air Canada, as it's now or soon will be known, to continue to retain the present staff in the installation here in Manitoba.

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.)

So I say, Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the fact that the Prime Minister of Canada has reiterated what he told our delegation insofar as the base is concerned, and his support for us at least until '73, that we must continuously make our representations insofar as the retention if at all possible, of the present staff.

Also, Madam Speaker, even though we may be finished with one aspect on the question regarding TCA, we certainly have not completed deliberations and discussions on the formation of a national air policy and how that might affect Manitoba. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that this is a very vital concern to this Legislature and that while the resolution that we have been discussing is primarily dealing with the staff and personnel of TCA, we are also vitally concerned and had a good discussion I would suggest during the debate as to the necessity of establishing an air policy for Manitoba, and indeed even further and possibly more vital is that of inducing the Government of Canada to establish an air policy for this great Dominion, because it seems almost criminal in my opinion, Madam Speaker, that while we are boastful of this Dominion of ours, we are going to celebrate in a very short period of time 100 years of Confederation and that in all of this 100 years we still have not got an air policy in Canada. We haven't got a regional air policy.

We talk about how fast we're advancing. We can travel from coast to coast by our newer forms of transport and yet we don't really know on what basis we travel or even in what direction we are going to travel. This was particularly, I suggest Madam Speaker, pinpointed the other day when a party and her daughter from Scotland found herself landing here at our so-called international airport in Winnipeg, didn't know whether she was going to be sent back on the next plane or what was going to be the situation insofar as she was concerned.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that out of the debate that has been held in this House regarding TCA, let us not forget the very vital question of having established, or attempting to have established a regional air policy which will include the Province of Manitoba and the western provinces, and indeed a federal policy as well.

I would like to conclude my remarks in a further appeal to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that notwithstanding again the telegrams that we have received from the Prime Minister of Canada respecting TCA, that he does call together, as I have requested on at least three occasions this year, call together again the delegation that went down to Ottawa on behalf of the retention of the Trans Canada Airlines here and discuss with these men -- because I feel that they did represent a broad area of public opinion in the province -- discuss with them their ideas as to what they feel should be an air policy for this particular region. I think they have a lot to contribute to the whole question of air policy in this sector and also of course in the broader sector.

So I say, Madam Speaker, now that we've had our discussions, now that we've exhibited some differences of opinion as to whether you did or whether you didn't, let us unite as we were united at least on two delegations that went to Ottawa and do our utmost to retain the base here in Manitoba with the fullest employment possible, and let us lend our united endeavours in trying to arrive at an air policy that will enhance the future well-being of the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution. The Honourable Member for Inkster always does a good job, but I couldn't help but adjourn the debate when I heard some of the remarks that the Honourable Member from Ethelbert had made regarding that no member of the whole CCP Party, of the Independent Labour Party or the New Democratic Party had nothing to do with the first pension being instituted in the Dominion of Canada -- (Interjection) -- All right, the CCF Party. You also mentioned the Independent Labour Party -- the Party today. You said the only reason that we did this was so that we could get a copy of this letter and publish it and get copies published and hang them in our committee rooms. I think, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member from Ethelbert knows very well that he was mistaken and was wrong, and he was trying to get something for him to hang in all the Liberal Party committee rooms across Canada, because he would take

(Mr. Peters, Cont'd.) . . . this speech and have it re-typed or have it republished and reproduced and say "this is not so." I would like to refer him, Madam Speaker, to some remarks that were made by people that were there when this first pension bill was passed. I read this out, I think two years ago, and I guess we'd better read it again for the honourable member. Maybe I'll get a copy made and I'll present it to him, then he won't forget it. -- (Interjection) -- I think I probably will.

Madam Speaker, this is quoting from Canadian Labour March 1962, and it says: "Senate debate on first pension bill. In 1926" -- by the time we're finished you'll wish they had. "In 1926 labour members of Parliament J. S. Woodsworth and A. A. Yeats were able to exploit the fact that they, with a few sympathetic farmer progressives, held the balance of power in the House of Commons by forcing the brand new Liberal government to introduce Old Age Pensions. The first Old Age Pension Bill became law on March 31, 1927. It provided for pensions of \$20.00 a month at the age of 70. Debate on the matter particularly in the senate produced some remarkable observations from men who themselves had been granted substantial lifetime pensions." Some excerpts from Hansard followed. "The men who promoted the bill do not represent a body of people in this country prepared to contribute to it. They are representative of a body of so-called labour who do not want to encourage or practice thrift. They are men who work to burn the candle at both ends, to spend all you make and when you are 65 or 70 and unable to work, go to those people who have been leading well-ordered lives, who have been practicing the good old habit of thrift." These were the remarks of Senator McCormick -- (Interjection) -- He certainly wasn't a CCFer. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sure that he was.

And this is by Senator Beaubien: "This in my opinion is a . . . matter. First of all, it is unhealthy in its basic moral principles." Senator Robertson: "This thing was conceived in dishonesty." These are the remarks by Liberal senators of the day in 1926, and you're the ones that are trying to -- (Interjection) -- Darn right! And Senator Beaubien on the same debate, Madam Speaker, "if this bill passes, the obligation of the children to look after their father and mother and grandfather and grandmother goes by the board. It is judicious for us to impose upon our country such socialistic legislation as this because it is nothing else, when there is no call for it." These were remarks that were made. Finally, the Liberal Party decided that maybe it wasn't so socialistic after all, and the honourable member from the . . . . said that he couldn't support this resolution because there was a pension bill being introduced. Well, it's marked "3" now. I don't know what mark it'll be before it's finally introduced and passed in the House of Commons.

While I'm at it, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House here was complaining about some of the regulations we had when collecting premiums under hospitalization and how horrible these regulations were where people could go to jail. Well I want to read for the Honourable Members for the Liberal Party what the Liberal Party in Ottawa is intending to do with their regulations. I'm quoting, this is from the Tribune of Wednesday, March 18th, Madam Speaker: It makes good reading. Does the truth hurt a little? -- (Interjection) -- You know, you aren't the only ones that are absolutely right. You seem to think that you are the only ones that are right, but you're mostly wrong and you think you're right. "Employers who violate the provisions can be fined up to \$10,000 and sent to jail for six months." I would suggest to the honourable leader of the Liberal Party that he get in touch with his big brother in Ottawa and ask him to take a look at this and some of the administrative things. The Health Minister can declare a person legally dead although he's still alive. This is what they want to do in Ottawa -- the Liberal Party -- the Liberal Party is saying this. "A person legally married to one spouse can be deemed by the Minister to be . . . . to someone else. Boy of boy -- they aren't going to give anybody any administrative powers. Not much! -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, I'm sure you'll get lots of them, too!

So, Madam Speaker, I don't think I have to say any more on this subject. -- (Interjection) -- I've said plenty. I've drawn enough remarks from you to know that this is something that's got under your thick skins.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): I shall be brief, I'm always brief, but there is just one or two remarks made here that I'd like to reply and place myself on record. First of all, I would like



(Mr. Gray, cont'd)...to ask the honourable members here to read the resolution again. You may have forgotten it because it was submitted some time ago. The Resolution requests that consideration and in consultation with the federal government as a part of the centennial celebration, up to that date, 1967 of a reasonable Old Age Pension scheme. You don't have to pay out the money immediately. Give it consideration, and in case the other scheme which already has been mentioned doesn't come through -- if it does come through, they can amalgamate them altogether, so there is nothing wrong about this resolution and it does not interfere with any plans that may come or will come. Every honourable member knows that the Old Age Pension has been under consideration for a long time, perhaps since 1927, but so far nothing has been accomplished.

I was interested to read in the Free Press of March 3, 1964 -- they have a column "Looking Backward from the Free Press Files," and I think perhaps it is very useful. It says: "Twenty years ago, March 3, 1944, an old age pension resolution introduced by M.A. Gray, CCF Winnipeg, failed to receive the support of the provincial government. Mr. Gray's resolution had asked that the government increase the pension to \$30.00 per month." And looking up the journals of that day, 1944, I find there were only two members in this House now as MLAs 20 years ago. This was the Honourable Member from Lakeside and the Honourable Member from Inkster. I supported it, the honourable member opposed it -- a \$5.00 increase-- long after the old age pension of \$20.00 a month had been passed. Now this is on record and no one can deny it. I hope that the Honourable Member from Lakeside -- I'm sorry he's not in his seat -- would probably ask for forgiveness now. I think if history will be read as to the treatment that we have given the old age pensioners -- and I have repeated it many many times -- who have built our civilization in Canada; who have sacrificed their lives to building the railroads, the tunnels and the sewers and what have you; who have built this building at a low wage of 15-20 cents an hour at that time -- I know these were the wages I got, probably I'm not worth any more -- but the others did work and could not save a cent and had to send their children to school and did not have any social help like we have today; and when they had to retire, they'd been retired or they were fired because the young boys can do their work better than men of 60 or 65, without relief, without anything. How much can he save up for the old age pension?

And even at that time the motion was defeated. The original motion was defeated and an amendment to that motion, whitewashing the motion, making it not so active was also defeated. Of course I'm not blaming anybody here except the one member. I'm not singling him out without due respect to him. He has made a tremendous contribution in this province, but the facts are facts. Even last year, going 23 years later, we also see that a similar motion has been defeated by many of the honourable members that are sitting here now. The funny part is this -- and I tell another incident -- during the regime of Mr. Garson as Premier of this province, a motion came from our group to increase \$5.00 -- definitely proved by buying food in the chain stores where you could get it cheaper -- that the people cannot exist on such a small amount -- definitely proven. It was turned down, but Mr. Garson managed -- I don't know how -- and months after the House adjourned to get another \$5.00.

So this here old age pension question has been thrown around here -- at whose expense? At the expense of the people that suffered; at the expense of the people who suffered, are hungry, who haven't got enough. And even today -- even today -- \$75.00 a month -- the moment the \$10.00 was increased, the moment it was increased, rent went up and the \$10.00 was almost taken away. And what am I suggesting now? First of all, a graduated increase, so let the old age also celebrate the Centennial with at least a little more financial help. Even if they'll get \$100 a month a third of it goes to rent and there only remains two-thirds, which is \$66 to buy food, necessities, clothing at the present rate. We may criticize in 1927 for the government only allowing \$20 a month, but the \$20 a month then was still more than the \$66 now, and not forgetting they can apply for some supplementary help. People don't want to go and put their hand out and say, "Here, Buddy can you spare me a dime?" They're respectable people but unfortunately have not saved up enough to live a little bit more comfortably in their golden age period, which is not very long judging by the number of deaths that occur among those 70 and over. I am not stating now that this is due to lack of food, but it is due to the lack of the general situation. So I say that what we are now asking is first of all to give consideration, at least let

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)...us all here state right now that we want to improve the situation, naturally not by ourselves, but with the federal government, and until such time as they have a pension system established. Immediately we suggest a little bit more help for the old aged and for the others. That honourable member says, where are we going to get the money, and immediately they take their pencil and they use their little knowledge of arithmetic and says it will cost hundreds and billions of dollars. When I came into this House, Madam Speaker, we had a budget of \$20 million -- I think less than \$20 million -- now we have \$151 million. Where are we getting the money? Where are we getting the money? Where are we getting the money all over? Where are we getting the money to pay high interest for people that don't do a stitch of work for their existence. They sleep while the interest grows. That's no excuse, where are we going to get the money. If you need it the money is here. All we need is the goodwill. All we need is the good wishes. All we need is a little bit of sympathy and consideration.

I am not going to prolong the debate. I am very much afraid, unless I'll be surprised -- and if I'm surprised I'll have a heart attack -- I'm very much afraid that this will be another "voice in the wilderness," but that voice will come as long as I'm here and as long as I live.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

Yeas: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, and Wright.

Nays: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 41.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, when I took the adjournment on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, I seemed to sense in this House an interest, and concern possibly, over the suggestion that the government should consider the feasibility of having the co-operative department of the Department of Agriculture investigate the possibility of taking over the operation of the sugar factory and to interest some co-operative body to take over the business.

Not being an expert on the production of sugar in any of its phases, I contacted the co-operative department and asked them for information that I could use in presenting my views to the House. I was informed that no co-operative body had ever requested such an action; however, the sugar beet producers themselves had given this particular matter consideration in the late '40's and had voted the proposition down. Now it isn't right to speculate why they might have done this but it could easily have been the magnitude of the capital costs for plant and equipment to produce sugar from sugar beets. I understand, however, that private interests with the assistance of the government of the day brought this plan for a sugar plant into being. It has been a successful enterprise for many years now and it has been of great benefit to the people of Manitoba and has been profitable to many hundreds of our farmers engaged in the raising of sugar beets.

I understand that the Manitoba beet growers have what might be termed a "co-operative arrangement" with the sugar company, the arrangement being that the growers produce the sugar beets, the Manitoba Sugar Company processes the product into sugar and by-products and the Manitoba Sugar Company sells the product with the producer and the company sharing in the returns from the sugar and the by-product sales. In establishing the net value of sugar the company deducts the cost of selling the product from the money received from it. When the net return is \$6.50 per cwt. for sugar the grower gets 59 percent of the return. When the net return is \$8.50 per cwt. the grower gets 63 percent. The percent to the grower floats between these two extremes as the net return changes.

A similar arrangement is carried out on the by-products, with the growers this year receiving 8 percent of the net return from molasses and beet pulp. The sugar company recognizes the rights of the producers in that the growers have a bargaining arrangement on a yearly basis. They have their auditors to inspect the sugar company's books and have a say in the conduct of the sugar company affairs, and may invest in the shares of the sugar company. In 1963 the number of farmers under contract were 775 approximately; the acreages under contract were 31,000 acres. The area extends from the south of Winnipeg to Emerson to Portage and also part of the Teulon area. If the Government of Manitoba should act on this suggestion and it was found for some unknown reason that the sugar company would give up the factory, these questions would arise and have to be faced: Who would we get to mind the store and look after the business? Where does the money come from to buy the factory? If a co-operative body of any kind were able to purchase the factory, would they be subjected to government control as to how much profit they would be allowed to make. Has this government any right to select some industry and subject it to investigation as to how they should govern themselves in their own business. Would prospective investors in business, manufacturing and other industries think that Manitoba would be a good and safe place to invest their capital?

It would be difficult to find easy and ready answers to these questions. I would suggest that it would not meet with the approval of the farmers involved in raising sugar beets. I don't think the public would like it overmuch and private enterprise operators in the province would shake with horror, I think. I really do not think that we have to consider answering these questions as they seem to smack of the fantastic; that they're a mere supposition, and more of a fairy tale than a matter of importance at this particular time. If the interests of expanding the economic future of our province and if the benefit of our farmers mean anything I would have to vote against this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, unless somebody else wishes to speak I would like to close the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I am not urging closing up of the present sugar industry which the government has been instrumental to build for a private enterprise. This should be remembered.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)... I'm not objecting to it. It was an opportunity to have sugar industry in Manitoba, to help out the farmers, particularly those who are unable to operate an independent farm or to grow beets and be able to sell their product. It came to everybody's attention suddenly without notice a year ago, a little over a year ago, of the tremendous unnecessary daily increase of the price of sugar to the consumer and this was recognized right here at that time by the government. A year ago, long before the advance of sugar we submitted a resolution on the same problem which read: "Whereas sugar is being produced in Manitoba by a single privately-owned corporation; and whereas the people of Manitoba are being obliged to pay prices for sugar which are higher than those being paid by sugar consumers in the neighbouring United States and do not derive the benefit of competition by local industry; and whereas the price paid to producers of sugar did appear to be controlled by this single corporation without the benefit to the consumer; therefore be it resolved the government give consideration to the advisability of instructing the co-operative department of the Department of Agriculture-- there was no suggestion of building it -- to make a study of ways and means of transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba from a privately-owned to a co-operatively-owned and co-operatively-operated enterprise, and make a report thereon to the Minister of Agriculture." Now let's be clear about it. The Department of Co-operatives is a branch of the Department of Agriculture. Those in charge are being paid. A little farther investigation will not do them any harm and it will not cost the province any money. It was turned down by a vote of 46 to 7. Right there and then the price of sugar advanced again. In the meantime the House adjourned and as it happened the First Minister, who voted against the resolution -- just to investigate, nothing else -- went to Ottawa in connection with the same matter because the price of sugar was high. So the head of this government realized that the price of sugar was unnecessary too high.

Now what does the present resolution read: That the government give consideration to the advisability of instructing the co-operative department of the Department of Agriculture to make a study of ways and means of transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba and just make the investigation, report back to the Minister, the Minister could report back to the House, and perhaps by that time either the price of sugar will stabilize or we could have a co-operative industry here run along the same lines as so-called private industry. No expense whatsoever. Not a cent would have to be spent. What happened? We had the cold shoulder again. Irrespective of the price of sugar -- and I have proven this when I introduced the Bill, I don't think I shall repeat it again -- of how they base the price of sugar -- and if you wish I could read it to you -- we have lots of time -- and let the members realize for themselves, but however, I'm not going to do it. Now the situation at the present time is this. If a public body of 57 members representing all classes, all political opinions, all interested parties in this province, come here in order to protect and defend the consumer which is the largest group of people in this province, and God knows the price is high as it is, and it has been proven by the press, they calculate their price on f.o.b. England or f.o.b. New York, and sugar which is consumed right here in Winnipeg we have to pay the -- and manufactured in Winnipeg -- we have to pay the freight from New York or pay for the freight from New York to Winnipeg.

Talk about the whole idea of opposing public ownership. This same province are controlling the Hydro power as a public ownership; water is a public ownership; telephone is a public ownership, every essential necessity right here is public ownership. The control of the other big companies is also public ownership. So why we are afraid to make just an investigation? I venture to say, Madam Speaker -- and I'll be through with this brief statement, I don't intend to accuse anyone -- if this resolution would have come from anyone else but our group more consideration would have been given, but the idea is, "Kill the enemy, don't let it grow."

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, it is very unfortunate that the Honourable Member for Morris is away in hospital and as a result of that I took it upon myself to do justice to the resolution which he had standing in his name.

Madam Speaker, it appears rather odd that sometimes we are concerned very much about accidents, and I do agree with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that he too is

(Mr. Klym, cont'd)... very much concerned about accidents taking place on that stretch of highway between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. However, I've often wondered whether building two-lane highways, four-lane highways or a multi-lane highway would solve such difficulties, whether it would prevent accidents. I do not think so. I think the thing we must do is try and find out what causes accidents and in the first place I am going to think of the colors of the different cars on the highway. Sure enough some young fellows like to buy a car which will exactly match their girl friend's dress. I am not fond of that. I like to see a dark color which is easily noticeable on the highway regardless of the time of the day or regardless of conditions of the road or climatic conditions. However, there are also the different size of cars that people drive. We have the high-powered cars, the medium-powered cars and we also have the wee, wee cars on the highway. Now, -- interjection -- never mind the teensy weensy, but we're just talking here about the small cars. Most of the accidents that I have noticed north of Winnipeg between here and Lockport on a four-lane highway was between a big Buick probably and a little Volkswagon or something like that. I do not know why but they do happen that way. It also happens between cars and great big vans and big trucks. Probably a truck has generally some advertising on them and people stop to read. It is probably fortunate for me because I read fast, that's why I'm still around. However, it does not matter whether I am around or not, but the causes of accidents have to be ascertained to some extent and we must try and solve them somehow.

Now that particular stretch of road again, Madam Speaker, is a monotonous stretch of road. I've driven on it many a time, whether it be in the daytime or at night and at certain points a fellow begins to doze away. The best thing to do is just slow down probably and get out of the car and walk around for a while and get some fresh air and then keep on going. However -- now there are also the rapid drivers, the overtakers -- and do you know something? It's the overtakers who keep the undertakers busy. At all times.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member while speaking to that resolution the other day, suggested to the government, or asked the question of the government, whether the government would consider a toll highway. Now Madam Speaker, it sounds rather odd because I think the honourable member knows better than talking about a toll highway. Had he been speaking about a toll bridge I would agree with him, probably it may be a little easier to administer. But a toll highway with all the farm gates and all the different crossroads, we would have a picnic trying to control the people. However, he suggested all those who did not want to pay toll could travel on No. 4, the old highway which was sometimes used as Trans-Canada or No. 1. Well, Madam Speaker, I do not agree with that. I don't think that we should go to work and deprive the people of Manitoba or Canada or anywhere from driving on the highway of their choice and probably the best highway going through our province. I still think that to get No. 4 in good order you'd have to go a long way to put it in the same shape that Trans-Canada is west. We all know that probably in time we will require a four-lane highway there, but, Madam Speaker, let us not forget that every highway is a busy highway but I've seen accidents happen on highways where there were only two cars involved, there were no other cars around for miles. So what are we going to do about that?

Now, let us talk about Trans-Canada east. Trans-Canada east has four-lanes here at Warrens Corner; a serious accident took place sometime in January I believe. Accidents have taken place on all highways. Would he consider a four-lane highway at Dauphin where a bus and a car collision took place? The car hit the bus from the rear. Would a four-lane have helped that? I cannot see it. Unless I could get further information on that.

Madam Speaker it appears to me that safety precautions have been taken by the Department of Public Works of Manitoba on Trans-Canada Highway west of Headingley toward Portage la Prairie. We have such things as delineators, the white posts with reflectors at Elie. A forty mile stretch to my estimation is very monotonous. Probably that is why the accidents occur and probably again, you know, I'm very glad that the manufacturers have thought of something and that's the seat belt because I see right now there are more people sitting in their own respective seats rather than two in one driving. Our roads, such as the road west of Winnipeg, is well marked, well constructed, well designated. Probably the driver thinks he'll never get lost and just keeps going and speeds along, his foot gets a little too heavy and then he gets on the wrong side somewhere and runs into someone. There are

(Mr. Klym, cont'd)... deceleration lines at Elie junction. What more could one do to improve the situation. I was just talking to two travellers from Quebec about two weeks ago right here in this building. They told me they've never been on finer roads than when they entered Manitoba. I told them, just for the fun of it, that I didn't think so. He said, you should come to Quebec, then you'll see something, we really suffer out there.

However, Madam Speaker, I think that I've belaboured this long enough. It was pretty hard for me to juggle the words around and not say the same thing in the same way. Now, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin that the motion be amended by deleting all of those words after "Whereas" in the first line and substituting therefor: "Traffic flows on the Trans-Canada Highway between the junction of PTH No. 4 west of Headingley and the junction of PTH No. 4 west of Portage la Prairie, indicates the desirability of increasing traffic facilities at an early date; and Whereas the accident rate on this section of highway, while not being above-average, continues to warrant concern as does the accident rate throughout all of Manitoba; and Whereas negotiations are continuing for the acquisition of the Canadian National Railways . . . . . subdivision; and Whereas the Minister of Public Works has announced the intention of the government to proceed this year with the Portage la Prairie by-pass as the initial stage of this over-all project; Therefore be it resolved this House commend the government on the commencement of this project which will provide a four-lane divided highway between the junction of PTH No. 4 west of Headingley to the junction of PTH No. 4 west of Portage la Prairie."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, will the last honourable member permit a question. Can he tell me how many deaths have resulted because of the lack of a by-pass around Portage?

MR. KLYM: Madam Speaker . . . . . track of any of those things that took place around Portage la Prairie at any time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I believe the member inferred that this was the first step to avoid accidents.

MR. KLYM: So it is. . . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: I believe the member inferred that the constructing of a by-pass was the first step to be taken to avoid accidents on that highway. Is that correct?

MR. KLYM: Well that is the beginning . . . . . of the highway, and furthermore by-passing the City of Portage la Prairie will prevent accidents right in Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Could the honourable member tell me how many deaths there has been in accidents in Portage la Prairie in the last ten years? None.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say Aye.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that, Whereas unscrupulous sales methods result in serious losses to people who are usually least capable of bearing them; and whereas organizations such as the Better Business Bureaus do very effective work but are limited in scope and without enforcement powers; therefore be it resolved that the Government give immediate consideration to the advisability of protecting consumers from fraudulent practices or misleading and deceptive sales methods.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker I have carefully couched the language of this resolution so as to assure myself that it is most general in its terms so as to enable the widest possible discussion and so as to make it least compulsory if it were to be accepted. I feel that this is a suggestion which will merit a great deal of discussion and if it receives the kind of treatment that it may receive in that it may not pass at this session it certainly will be reviewed again and again, because, Madam Speaker, I think that we all recognize that the intensive sales methods that have accompanied the commercial world today have brought with them a great deal of high-pressure forms of sales, unscrupulous methods of attacking the

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... problem of maintaining a high level of sales and, as a result, involving people into making contracts which they do not fully understand. And therefore, Madam Speaker, I have put this forward in such a general way that we could be able to discuss the proposition that we are suggesting and that is that some attention be paid to the problem in the expectation that some solution or some method of alleviating the problem will be discovered.

Our suggestion is that this take the form of a department of government. We feel that the matter of protection of the consumer is one which merits the full-time attention of a department and of a staff. If it is felt that this is not the correct step to take at this stage then I would think that at least it could be a division of an existing department, but still one which would recognize the problem and attempt to tackle it -- and I speak not only of unscrupulous methods but I speak generally in an attempt to assess the problems which face consumers, and in their interests. Now the problem that we are aware of is one which attacks the uninformed consumer. It attacks the unwary consumer. It takes its shape in many forms, but we are now accustomed to door-to-door sales methods which catch the unwary housewife at a time when she has her mind on other matters than actually to purchase an article which the salesman is most anxious to unload on her household. I am sure that members of this House have had occasion to read of proposals which occurred in Britain dealing with this particular problem with which I will deal in a few moments. I speak of bait advertising -- advertising which proposes what appears to be a marvelous bargain but which, when the purchase is actually attempted to be made is discovered to have been sold out and a substitute proposed, or a conviction given to the customer that the article advertised is inferior and by very little more a better product could be obtained. I speak of contracts that are entered into with elaborate looking guarantees on very good bond paper which have very attractive looking margins and very fancy signatures, but which when you come to the text of them promise nothing and give nothing. I speak of all the verbal promises that accompany so many of the transactions that take place, the promise saying, "Well if you don't like it regardless of what it says in the contract, bring it back and we'll refund the money." I speak of all the excessive financing charges which we have discussed at great length on other occasions in this House. I speak of the end payments on time contract that come with a big balloon with a large amount payable which the customer is not aware, will come because the customer is led to believe that payments at a regular basis on a regular interval of a certain amount will finally pay off the article or the purchase. I speak of dishonest repair men who promise everything for the price of a visit and who actually then start to build up a tremendous bill in repair.

Madam Speaker, to point out this problem I want to switch over to speak of what I consider to be one of the most ethical retail sales outlets that we have in this City of Winnipeg -- and I speak now of the T. Eaton Company where I do very little of my purchasing, but that's only because of the method in which I -- the normal places where I do make my purchases -- but whose reputation in Winnipeg I think stands very high as one of the more ethical retail sales outlets, one of the firms that always makes every effort to stand behind its name in bringing forth its products as being those which stand up to what the advertisement says. And I mention this firm because I came across a clipping, a story in the Winnipeg Tribune, of the issue of February 21, 1964, which brought I thought, a most challenging approach to this problem, and wanting to read various excerpts from it I came to the conclusion that it would be just as quick and definitely worthwhile to read most of it. So that without being invited by anybody to read all of it I propose to read a good deal of it. It is an article which is headed: "Businessmen Walk Moral Tightrope - Sometimes Slip." It's a Canadian Press dispatch from Montreal. "A Montreal executive says too many businessmen leave their ethics at home when they go to work. Ken McAdam, Management Development Co-ordinator of the T. Eaton Co. Ltd. says there is a contradiction between ethical behaviour and the profit motivation of business which is very difficult to resolve. There was a large favourable response when he raised the issue at an inter-denominational forum at St. Edmund of Canterbury Roman Catholic Church in suburban Beaconsfield. 'Perhaps innocently and without thinking some businessmen come to regard sharp business practices as indicative of smartness', Mr. McAdam told the forum. They do not stop to consider that they have set for themselves a double standard. This man must break up his personal ethical code and slip the shattered pieces into separate compartments. People with no experience in business, Mr. McAdam said, must sometimes wonder why it is not a

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... simple matter to conduct all business dealings in accordance with the highest ethical standards. Surely, they say, you don't have to be a saint to decide whether a given course is right or wrong. In practice the proposition isn't that simple. Almost daily businessmen face decisions involving ethical questions not easily solved. He must walk a moral tightrope trying fairly to balance conflicting interests of stockholders, employees, customers, and suppliers. Some businessmen carefully observe all the formalities of their religious faith and are known for their regular church attendance at church or synagogue services, yet these same people in many cases become tough and even unethical in their business dealings." This is the major part of the clipping and I think brings to our attention the fact that one of the men charged by one of the largest chain retail stores in Canada, charged with the problem of management development co-ordination recognizes that practices such as he describes may occur in the best of faith on the part of the people who are in the sales field, but he points out that in spite of their good faith occasions arise where they cannot reconcile their integrity or their desire for integrity with the need to produce a profit dollar.

Well, how do we cope with this problem, Madam Speaker? We have a Time Sales Act which this government enacted I think about two years ago and didn't bring into being until about a year ago, after having changed the approach to the problem to some extent. It now discloses the dollar cost. Since it was passed a year ago I have not heard very much of the benefit -- mind you I haven't heard much of the problems which it has created. We now have, and I commend the government for bringing forth to us the Unconscionable Transactions Act which was an Act in the Province of Ontario for many years and which the Ontario government had occasion to the Privy Council in order to establish its validity. This proposed Act, which will be reviewed in time, deals only with the matter of loans, not other forms of transaction. We have some sort of attempt suggested to look at the problem of used car sales and I was interested when my leader showed me yesterday a proposed Bill which has been presented to the House in Ontario just recently by the -- shall I say former or erstwhile Attorney-General of that province who left recently the position which he had graced -- but which while he was there he was able to use to bring a bill to the Ontario House proposing both the licensing of used car dealers and the bonding of used car dealers. However, this government has not seen fit to accept that proposal.

We have some suggestion made that we will be doing something about licensing mortgage brokers -- whether that will improve the situation or not I am not sure because the problem will no doubt remain. But these attempts which apparently are being made by this government are sporadic, they are specific, but they are shall I say, fairly small steps along the line of handling the problem of consumer protection, but they do not tackle and they do not propose to tackle the overall problem, and the overall problem involves many aspects, the criminal law is one which this government or its speaker may yet say will protect the consumer, but the criminal law is only of use when you can actually prove a fraud, a fraudulent act. The criminal law is there to protect the person against whom an offence has been committed and it results in punishment to the offender, but it makes no effort or cannot make any attempt to repay the financial loss which this person may have suffered because of his dealings with the offender, so he resorts to civil law, and the civil law then deals mainly with written contracts and I've already referred to the fact that more and more occasions occur when verbal promises take the place of what is written on the contract which is eventually signed. And then when you have a written contract it's often too late anyway because of the sales methods that have been used. And then with civil law we have the problems of going to court, we have the problems of legal costs, and although lawyers will often tell you that they don't make very much money, there is no doubt that the cost to the client is one which the client must feel, especially -- interjection -- I didn't quote any lawyer saying that, I said lawyers may ... and who knows, lawyers may. The problem that often arises in small transactions is the one where the legal costs involved and the time taken is as much as and possibly more than, the loss which has taken place, because no lawyer will be able to undertake a case involving a transaction let us say of \$20 - \$30 and be able to give the proper service to the client without having to charge a fee, or to give his work free, and that in either case ought to be accepted as being an improper use of the Court.

Therefore, I feel that we must look for some means whereby consumer protection



(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... methods are put under one person so that the overall responsibility will be his. I suggest that it is difficult to legislate piecemeal. I suggest that it is difficult to legislate for many of the practices which I have attempted to describe in general form. I suggest that legislation alone will not carry out the effect of the protection that consumers are entitled to have. I think that it is very important that there be a means whereby consumers will be educated as to what to look for, will be informed as to what is one or another form of sales technique which will be taking place. And therefore, I feel that a department could well undertake this task which, as I point out in the resolution, the Better Business Bureau cannot undertake because it does not have the means whereby to do it, and the fact it does not to that extent undertake. Problems as they arise are matters which can be recorded for research and for further use. One can plan future legislation on the basis of what a department of this type could learn, and I refer now to the mention I made earlier of what is being considered in Great Britain, and I read now from a Free Press clipping of November 30, 1963, which reported then a proposed bill which was being brought into parliament that week and which it was expected would become law sometime this year, which would protect innocent purchasers of second-hand cars who later discovered the vehicle is really owned by a financing company. "The bill could well be" -- I'm now reading the clipping -- "The bill could well be the most popular piece of legislation in the coming session. Consumer protection is becoming increasingly important in affluent Britain where the abuses of high-pressure salesmanship are beginning to make themselves felt. In particular, newspaper and consumer organizations have recently been waging campaigns against door-to-door salesmen who trap weak housewives into buying domestic products the family can ill afford. Under the new bill there will be a cooling-off period of four days during which the purchaser can decide whether to keep the product. If he decides not to the company must take the product back." And there is reference made that this cooling-off period is for sales which are made by a door-to-door salesman who comes uninvited to the purchaser, or to the customer or the prospect and then is unable to give the sales talk to that prospect. It does not refer to the -- I was hoping I could have finished my sentence, but I wasn't -- but not only could I not finish the sentence, I could not even give the name of the bill, because it's not mentioned in the Act. However, I am under the . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: . . . I didn't want to interrupt you in the middle of a sentence.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate very much the attention which I am receiving, and that is why I smiled when I mentioned the fact that I was interrupted, but I would be happy to inform the Honourable First Minister that I am under the impression that the person who preceded me in this House in the constituency which I now represent has already proposed or is about to propose a similar bill in the federal House. I frankly do not know to what extent it could be a federal jurisdiction but it is one which I will try to get more information on in order to give the Honourable the First Minister the fullest possible assistance in seeking out the most favourable type of legislation in the interests of the consumers of this province.

May I come back now, Madam Speaker to the sentence which I left hanging in limbo somewhere, and suggest that the cooling-off period mentioned in this Bill refers to the unwary prospect who did not ask to do business but who was approached, the thought being that a person who wants to buy an article in going to a store has the opportunity to investigate the prices, to investigate the quality, to investigate the comparative prices in other stores, and thus is on his own responsibility in finding the product; but the person who is approached, having no idea that he is even going to consider purchasing an article and who is approached and caught unaware by a sales talk would benefit from this type of cooling-off period. I suggest that a department such as we mentioned would be one which would see to the enforcement of the present laws by instituting or instigating prosecutions, by recommending in other cases that the consumer seek protection through civil action, with the assistance of their own lawyer, of pointing out the facilities of the Law Society Legal Aid Committee to those who cannot afford to finance a costly action, or by referral to a licensing authority for review by the licensing authority which has licensed the salesman or the sales body. I think a department of this type could do a great deal by revealing to the public for its disapproval or at least for its edification sales methods which are being used for certain products.

I had occasion this weekend to see an advertisement which appeared in both newspapers, and which speaks of building a fine record library and getting a Hi-Fi set free -- get a free

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... Fleetwood Stereo Hi-Fi -- and reading this article throughout one learns that by buying records, one joins a club, one gets a bonus of five records free and one also gets a free Hi-Fi set and there's a pretty good looking one in the picture in this advertisement. I telephoned the Better Business Bureau. I asked them what they knew about it. They said all they know is that this is not quite clear -- it's not just a free Stereo Hi-Fi being offered by a record sales firm, but rather one where a sales outlet is selling Hi-Fi's and records together, and making it sound more attractive by putting a cost on the records, and the Hi-Fi set free. Now, I don't think that people generally know to call the Better Business Bureau, and having called them I don't know that they get much help in being guided on just what the proposition is, because I've discovered that in this particular case the Better Business Bureau read to me a written statement and were unable to give much by way of answers to questions that arose in my mind as a result of having read that statement; so that although their intentions were good and they were helpful to some extent, they were not completely helpful to me in trying to understand the type of offer that was being made. But I do know that at the bottom of the advertisement there is a telephone number which reads -- gives the phone number and says: "The switchboard is open round the clock." If you can't reach them by telephone there's also a coupon which you can answer. I might suggest inferentially -- in passing rather, Madam Speaker, that I question the propriety -- I don't condemn it, I just question the propriety or the ethics of the newspapers who accept advertisements such as these with sufficient, I think, sophistication to suspect that the story isn't quite as clear as is made to appear in the newspaper, but naturally the newspapers would not want to be accused of censoring the advertisement, and that is probably their answer.

Madam Speaker, I want to close by stressing again that the value of a department such as I describe would be to inform and to educate, to issue bulletins, to use communication media of various types for the purpose of informing and the purpose of educating the public; to have the facilities to answer questions which may arise in the minds of the public when a customer is about to enter into a transaction. The consumer, Madam Speaker, is a member of probably the least organized group in our society. We have protections that are brought about through groups which meet together which find that there is something that they have in common, be they trade unions, be they chambers of commerce, be they manufacturing organizations, be they what they are they have some form of protection; they have some method whereby they can set up offices to inform and educate themselves. In this case, I submit the consumers are not in a position to do so, and I say that this is a governmental responsibility. I think that the consumer, who is all of us, is entitled to the protection which the government can offer with its resources, and I urge the government to accept this resolution in the general form in which it is so that the government will not feel that it will be embarrassed by accepting it; that it will be forced to accept a particular method whereby it will accomplish the end. I urge the government and this House to accept the principle and that is that something can be done and ought to be done to protect the consumer from the various unscrupulous methods which are now being used in making sales to them.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood -- Interjection -- The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, on examining the comments of the various members who spoke on this resolution, it was shown that some people could charge as high as 31 and 32 percent in interest rates, so it would seem that we need some solution to this problem. Now, we cannot slough this thing off and say that it is being brought up in various places -- in Ottawa and such places like that. We have to try and bring in something that would protect the people in this respect, that they should be shown and it should be explained to them what the interest rates are when they go to buy some article. In spite of the differences of opinion as to the method of bringing about consumer protection everyone is agreed that these fraudulent practices do exist, and that the consumer definitely needs protection against them. We cannot stand by and just ignore what goes wrong. With this in mind, I would like to propose

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)... an amendment to the resolution that might reconcile these differences and bring about effective legislation to deal with this problem. This amendment that I suggest, or was suggested, was suggested by the Honourable Member for Lakeside to further and strengthen the resolution. Now, I would like to commend the member in this respect, that he's trying to bring out something to safeguard everyone that is going out to buy into the market, and I commend him very highly for doing so. So, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that the resolution be amended by adding in the second paragraph thereof after the words: "in the interest of fair competition," the words "and for the protection of the borrowers or purchasers." Thank you.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution, I'm a little disturbed by my qualifications unless it would be that I have 33 years of married life, but I think the Honourable Member for St. John's in putting forward this resolution has young marriages particularly in mind. I'm a little surprised that no one has risen to amend it along the lines that it only apply to young people.

Madam Speaker, there's strong evidence today that it's immaturity and a lack of preparation -- I think these are the main reasons for the failure of marriages today and there's no doubt that there's a disproportionate number of young marriages among those that fail. Marriage is a deeply personal relationship and there are many reasons for its failure. Sometimes when people complain about the union that they have made there's oftentimes a very great difference between the reasons they give and the real reasons. Immaturity is, I think, one of the greatest factors in the breakdown of marriage. People are dependent on their parents and they are unable to accept the responsibilities which married life certainly calls for. Then there is marriage and family responsibilities and today these are more complex in the society in which we live today and the average age of marriage is steadily decreasing. Sometimes there's a difference in background, social, economic or religious. All these factors make the decision of marriage more difficult.

I believe that inadequate preparation -- I remember that when I was about to be married our Minister had a little talk -- this is not really a new idea because I believe that most Ministers of the United Church do that when they are about to marry a young couple. They talk about your job and the financial security that you have. These things are always welcome by young people who are sincere about getting married.

Today, Madam Speaker, we see so many material things being dangled before the eyes of people. We are besieged by advertising on every hand and financial problems I think are far more serious today than ever before. Then there's the lack of marital aptitude. People are not really trained for this serious business of marriage. People who are normally mature in less intimate and less demanding relationships sometimes have little concern for domestic values. I think that preparation would certainly do something to improve this. Then there is external interference too, sometimes from in-laws or vocational demands; sometimes strenuous courses of study places a very great strain upon youthful marriages; and then many young people today have a sort of a trial approach attitude to marriage, saying, "oh well if it doesn't succeed it can easily be annulled." This is a very serious thing. And they're not willing sometimes to persevere through the various trials that marriage calls for.

My honourable colleague said that he simply wanted these young people to be able to talk to someone competent to advise them, and the Honourable Member for St. Matthews said that an interview would do little good. I believe it does. I think that there's a great longing today for people to talk to someone and even if it only helps a few I think it's very desirable because the business of getting married is very serious and young people themselves, I suggest, are not too sure of themselves, and oftentimes their jobs are not too secure. I think that to have someone sit down to talk to them who is not only sympathetic but empathetic, a person who can project themselves into the situation that the young people are about to put themselves certainly

(Mr. Wright, cont'd)... helps. It's been said that it's called foolish to turn the other cheek sometimes but I think that it would be an intelligent thing to expose people and I know we are dealing with the fact that whether we should have it voluntary or compulsory because the Honourable Member for St. Matthews said that unless it was voluntary he could see no purpose in it. I suggest that many people are timid; that it's for their own good. I can see no harm in making it compulsory. I'm not too concerned about the people of more mature years because I think that oftentimes there 's a period of engagement, but I can see no real reason why they would object to it. I agree that perhaps it is late sometimes and that much more could have been done at home or in the school or at the church in regard to preparation for marriage, and I do not subscribe to the statement that the interview doesn't get us anywhere. Many people have been helped by the concern and the real friendship of other people and I think the kind of people mentioned in the resolution by my honourable colleague, such as a Minister, teacher, medical practitioner or social worker, are people who are interested in humanity in general and I think that even if a few people can be saved from making a serious mistake which will affect them in later years, is certainly not to be discarded as just being of no use.

Madam Speaker, I certainly will vote for the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I can close the debate now if . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: I have a good limitation, I also have permission from the Whip of the Liberal Party to close the debate so I propose to do so as quickly as I can so as not to keep him here too long.

I want first to thank one of the members of this House who sent to me a clipping from a newspaper -- oh yes, from the Winnipeg Free Press, March 14th, 1964, which reports that a New York legislator believes that all prospective brides and bridegrooms under 25 should hear lectures by a clergyman or a judge before marriage. This assemblyman, Edward F. Crawford has introduced a bill that would require such a lecture or consultation on the responsibilities of marriage. The objective he said is to reduce the incidence of marriage failures and broken homes and thus cut welfare costs.

Well Madam Speaker, I'm happy and appreciate the opportunity to know that the idea that I have proposed may appear to be ludicrous to some -- and I speak now of some of the newspapers and also the Honourable the Member from St. Matthews -- but at least there is one man in the state of New York who shares the point of view which I have tried to express. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I listened to the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, who other than members of my own party is the only person who took the trouble to address himself to this problem -- as far as I can recall -- to the extent that he thought it worth responding to the remarks which I had made. And I appreciate his doing so, but when he concluded he came up to me and he said to me that we really weren't so far apart, that he thought there was some merit to what I had said, and I said something unkind to him, and I might just as well repeat it now. I said to him that I intended to read what he had said and if I understood it I would reply to it because I did not really understand him when he spoke. I therefore took the trouble to read what he said in Hansard after he had spoken, and I came to the conclusion that although I had now taken the trouble to read what he had said, I don't think he had taken the trouble to read, or to listen to what I had said, and that's why I am bound to agree with him that we really aren't so far apart, Madam Speaker because he criticized those features which I did not propose to make part of this resolution. He criticized the compulsive nature of it as being an ineffective means of advising, or counselling young people. I agreed with that and I said it, and I said, "I don't want to make it compulsory that they take counselling," I said, "I want to make it compulsory that they visit somebody who would have an opportunity to recommend counselling." And I made it clear that if they would not accept the counselling it would be nonsense to try and force it on them, but at least to ask them, or to compel them to come to hear somebody make a recommendation. Now if that's the kind of compulsion that the Honourable the Member from St. Matthews rejects then he must feel most uncomfortable in this society where there are much more trivial matters entered into where compulsion becomes part of the approach which these people must have to the contract into which they wish to enter.

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)...

He then laughed at the inadequacy of the interview, pointing out that an interview has to be much more extensive. I agree with that but I see no point in his laughing at that inadequacy. He did me a disservice I believe, Madam Speaker, in suggesting that I compared the training for operating high pressure boilers with the sacred marriage pact. I think that I consider this marriage pact so important, the ramifications so great that I pointed out that even in so menial a task as -- I'm going to have the boilermakers' union descend on me -- but so relatively less important task of handling boilermakers there must be preparations as I suggested there should be for marriage. And finally, the Honourable the Member from St. Matthews suggested in his address that it would be a fine thing, and I quote now from page 1332 of Hansard, "if there could be attached to the marriage license a pamphlet dealing with marriage preparation with a heading such as: Aids for Happy and Secure Family Life." Madam Speaker, he suggested what I myself suggested, and that is, that there should be some warning to young people before they get married that they should think twice, three times and four times before they do so. I hope this House will accept the thought that there should be some effort made to prepare people for marriage in some way.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30.

MR. MARTIN: Would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: If Madam Speaker will, I will.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.